

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 31 December 2001 with nineteen claims, three of which were written in independent form. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, and 13 were amended, and Claims 20-22 added, on 8 January 2004. Claims 6-9 have been allowed.

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-18, 20, and 22 have been amended to clarify what is being claimed and not for purposes of patentability or to narrow the claims.

Claims 2-9, 20 and 21 were objected to for reciting "reflective element" when the element is not always reflective. "Reflective element" has been amended to simply "first element" to overcome this objection.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,327,413 to Fritz ("Fritz"). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

MPEP § 2131 provides:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference."

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053, (Fed. Cir. 1987). . . . "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the . . . claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

As shown by the Examiner's annotation to Figure 4 of Fritz, the Examiner has improperly divided a single lens in two pieces and assigned each piece to a different prism. Thus, the Examiner has divided a single curved lens surface and used it for both "a first curved lens surface" and "a second curved surface" recited by Claim 1. Thus, not all elements recited by Claim 1 are shown in Fritz. The Examiner's rejection of Claim 1 therefore is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fritz. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Amended Claim 2 recites, "a monolithic optical element comprising a first element

portion and a lens element portion separated by a slit formed in said monolithic optical element." Fritz does not show, teach, or suggest this limitation.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,905,545 to Poradish et al. ("Poradish"). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Amended Claim 10 recites, "a monolithic optical element comprising a reflecting element portion and a lens element portion separated by a slit formed in said monolithic optical element." This limitation is not shown, taught, or suggested in the prior art of record.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poradish. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Amended Claim 13 recites, "providing a single integrated optical component comprising a TIR prism element and a lens element wherein the single integrated optical component is placed in the illumination path and also in the reflection path, wherein the single integrated optical component comprises a single optical piece having a slit disposed therein." This limitation is not shown, taught, or suggested in the prior art of record.

Claims 3-5, 11, 12, and 14-22 depend from Claims 1, 2, 10, and 13 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the present claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418

Amendment - Page 7

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.